

ED 402 049

PS 024 819

AUTHOR Weeks, Joyce
TITLE Developing Opportunities for Senior Citizens and 3- and 4-Year-Old Children in a Northeast U.S. Jewish Community Center to Interact.
PUB DATE 96
NOTE 70p.; Master's Practicum Report, Nova Southeastern University.
PUB TYPE Dissertations/Theses - Practicum Papers (043)
EDRS PRICE MF01/PC03 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Aging (Individuals); Community Centers; Community Programs; *Community Recreation Programs; Day Care; Day Care Centers; Grandparents; *Interaction; *Intergenerational Programs; Jews; *Older Adults; *Preschool Children; Preschool Education; Program Development; Program Improvement
IDENTIFIERS *Intergenerational Relationship; Jewish Culture; *Senior Citizen Centers; United States (Northeast)

ABSTRACT

Due to changes in society, young children and senior citizens have little opportunity for interaction. This practicum report formulated a plan for intergenerational interaction opportunities between 3- and 4-year-olds and senior citizens at a Jewish community center where separate programs for preschool children and senior citizens typified the lack of interaction. The goal of the practicum was to identify at least three opportunities for intergenerational interaction. This goal was accomplished via a 10-week strategy to determine opportunities for interaction and implement developmentally appropriate activities and opportunities. Information and recommendations were gathered from parents, teachers, staff, and seniors. Although inadequate time was allotted for full discussion of options, and seniors' ideas for intergenerational programming were much less interactive than those of parents, the affected populations were satisfied with 4 out of 5 options presented. Specific interaction projects agreed upon and developed included plans for an intergenerational Shabbat lunch and a Grandpals program. (Eight appendices include questionnaires for parents, seniors, children, and opportunity evaluation; a calendar plan for implementation; parent and senior involvement letter; field test results summary; and evaluation team letter. Contains 14 references.) (SD)

* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION
CENTER (ERIC)

☒ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

Developing Opportunities for Senior Citizens and
3- and 4-year-old Children in a
Northeast U.S. Jewish Community Center to Interact

by

Joyce Weeks

Cohort 73E

A Practicum Report Presented to the
Master's Programs in Life Span Care and Administration
in Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements
for the Degree of Master of Science

NOVA SOUTHEASTERN UNIVERSITY

1996

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND
DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL
HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Joyce Weeks

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES
INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Authorship Statement

I hereby testify that this paper and the work it reports are entirely my own. Where it has been necessary to draw from the work of others, published or unpublished, I have acknowledged such work in accordance with accepted scholarly and editorial practice. I give testimony freely, out of respect for the scholarship of other workers in the field and in the hope that my own work, presented here, will earn similar respect.

10/7/96
Date

Joyce Wells
Signature of Student

Abstract

Developing opportunities for senior citizens and 3- and 4-year-old children in a Northeast U.S. Jewish Community center to interact. Weeks, Joyce E., 1996: Practicum Report, Nova Southeastern University, Master's Programs in Life Span Care and Administration. Description: Senior Citizens/ Intergenerational/ Preschool/ Aging/ Young Children/ Aged/ Intergenerational Relations/ Grandparents/ Older Adults/ Day Care; Early Childhood Education/ Community Programs

Due to societal changes, demographics and life styles senior citizens and 3- and 4-year-old children have limited opportunities in which to interact. Because the author's agency serviced both these groups, the author felt that this was an ideal place for interaction to occur.

The author designed and implemented a strategy intended to formulate program opportunities during which interaction between 3- and 4-year-olds and seniors could take place.

Because this strategy took place in the summer when both groups were unavailable, the strategy focused on the planning process. The author involved various segments of the involved population in team meetings. These meetings resulted in a list of developmentally appropriate opportunities which were then field tested.

The positive responses lead the author to believe that intergenerational programs will be an important aspect of the agency's programming.

Table of Contents

Chapter	Page
I. Introduction and Background	1
The setting in which the problem occurs	1
The student's role in the setting	6
II. The Problem	8
Problem statement	8
Documentation of the problem	8
Analysis of the problem	11
III. Goals and Objectives	16
IV. Solution Strategy	18
Review of existing programs, models and approaches	18
Description of solution strategy	24
V. Implementation	26
VI. Conclusions and Recommendations	35

References	38
Appendix	40
A. Questionnaire for Parents	40
B. Questionnaire for Senior Citizens	43
C. Questionnaire for Children	46
D. Questionnaires for Opportunity Evaluation	49
E. Calendar Plan for Implementation	55
F. Parent and Senior Involvement Letter	59
G. Field Test Results Summary	61
H. Evaluation Team Letter	63

Chapter I - Introduction and Background

The setting in which the problem occurs

The setting for this practicum was a large Jewish community center which is located in an upper middle class suburban area approximately 30 miles east of New York City.

During World War II building of housing for civilians came to a virtual standstill in this area. At the same time there were sizable shifts in population. Many of these shifts were largely due to the many people mobilized into the armed services. There was a large influx of workers to work in the growing defense industries in the area. The end of the war brought demobilization and along with it the return of young men to begin new families. The region's growth was incredible. The decade starting in 1950 was the period of greatest population growth for the region. Between 1950 and 1960 the area's population grew 33.7% from 972,765 to 1,300,171 (Long Island Lighting Company [LILCO], 1995, p. iv). Since that time the population has leveled off. As of January 1, 1995 the population is estimated at 1,283,463 (LILCO, 1995, p. viii).

The average size of a household has declined while the number of households has continued to increase. Both the decrease in household size and the increase in the number of households can be attributed to the growing number of one person households. According to the Census Bureau the number of single person households in the area has more than doubled since 1970 (LILCO, 1995, p. viii).

Although it is a Jewish community center, this agency is open to all and serves a population of approximately 290,597 people, covering an area of 104.3 square miles. The median income is approximately \$75,265 (Townsend, 1996, p. 21).

As of January 1, 1995, more than 62% of this area's households earned over \$50,000 compared to 34% of all U.S. households. With a total EBI (Effective Buying Income, i.e. disposable income after taxes) of over \$62.1 billion the area ranks as 10th in the country (Townsend, 1996, p. 49).

There are 14,000 Jewish family households in the area. This constitutes 41% of the area households in general. Children and teenagers account for 26% of the area's Jewish population, while adults age 60 and older account for more than 20% of the total (Horowitz, 1995, p. 173).

This not-for-profit center services 8,406 members and approximately 9,000 non-members on an annual basis. There are currently 5,832 family members, 254 individual adult members (ages 26 to 59), 36 individual young adult members (ages 18 to 25), 350 individual senior members (ages 60 and over), 608 senior couples members, 195 teen members, 241 couple members and 120 senior club members. There are also corporate, summer-only and staff members.

The entire center is handicapped accessible. Departments in the center include Health and Physical Education (gym, pool, hot tub, racquet ball courts, track, exercise room and classes in all areas), Senior Department (activities for all stages of senior life) and Social Services Department (adult support groups, teens, young adults, singles, widowed and divorced groups).

For the writer's purpose this practicum concentrated on a fuller description of the Senior and Early Childhood Departments.

The Senior Department is run by a Senior Adult Services Supervisor and a Senior Adult Program Assistant. The supervisor has a Master of Social Work degree and is a Certified Social Worker. The assistant has a Master of Education degree. There is also a secretary and a liaison to the Board of Directors.

The Senior Adult Department plans and runs a variety of recreational and social activities for individuals 60 years of age and older, and couples in which at least one person is 60 years old. At the present time over 400 senior adults are participating in various activities. Many of these activities are free to members and only a nominal fee is charged to non-members.

Approximately 75 senior members are between the ages of 65 and 70, 250 senior members are between the ages of 70 and 80, and 75 members are over 80 years old.

An in-building Kosher Lunch Program provides lunch three times a week for over 60 adult seniors. The agency maintains specially equipped buses which transport 30 to 40 senior adults to the center.

Monday is 'Funday' for the senior adults. They are at the center from 10:00 a.m. until 2:30 p.m. They can choose from varied activities which include an art history lecture and discussion, cooking in the center's kitchen, exercise classes either in the pool or on the deck, a discussion group on Jewish thought, movies, a lecture on music appreciation or a walk on the indoor track.

On Tuesdays senior adults can join Yiddish Vinkle, which is a Yiddish discussion club at 10:30 to 11:30 a.m. and then stay for RADISH (Reserve a Day for Interesting Social Happenings) which is a self-directed group of retired individuals who plan and arrange for lectures on contemporary literature, health and social issues, culture and senior Jewish life.

Wednesdays offer the Wednesday Club which meets from 10:15 a.m. to 1:30 p.m. for programs focusing on social, recreational and educational experiences in a small group setting. Wednesday evenings couples age 65 and over meet for a variety of social and educational activities.

Every Thursday the Bridge Club, Mah Jong Club and Canasta Club meet from 1:00 to 3:00 p.m. In the evening, seniors age 65 and over who are single, widowed, separated or divorced meet for lectures, discussions, entertainment, special events and social networking.

Fridays the senior adults have a lunch followed by a program of Jewish content. They are at the center from 11:00 a.m. to 2:30 p.m. Special events and trips are also offered by the very busy Senior Adult Department.

The Director of the Early Childhood Department has Bachelor of Science and Master of Science degrees. The writer is the Assistant Director and has a Bachelor of Science degree in elementary education. Support staff in this department includes a secretary, transportation coordinator and bus maintenance supervisor. This department also has a liaison to the Board.

The Early Childhood Department includes nursery school, extended day care, toddler play group and a wide variety of other services for children ages 3 to 5 as well as programs for parents to participate in with their infants. All classes and programs are open to members and non-members.

There are 300 3- and 4-year-olds currently enrolled in the nursery school, 120 toddlers and 30 3- and 4-year-olds enrolled in the day care program. Approximately 200 children are also involved in before and after school programs.

The 3-year-olds attend classes either at 9:00 to 11:45 a.m. or 12:30 to 3:15 p.m. three or five times a week. There are a maximum of 18 children in each class and 3 teachers. The head teacher is state certified, but the assistants may or may not be. This more than meets the state requirements. Currently there are four morning classes and four afternoon classes for 3- and 4-year-olds.

Four-year-olds can attend classes five times a week either at 9:00 to 11:45 a.m. or 12:30 to 3:15 p.m. There are a maximum of 21 children in a class with one head teacher and two assistants. This also more than meets the state requirements. Currently there are four morning and four afternoon classes.

The Early Childhood Department also offers a day care class. Three- and four-year-old children can attend day care from as early as 7:00 a.m. and stay as late as 6:00 p.m. (5:00 p.m. on Fridays). The day care teacher brings the children to their nursery class and the nursery teachers bring them back to day care at the appropriate time. Day care is available only to members.

Programs which extend the child's nursery school hours are a large part of the schedule. These include children's cooking classes, art media classes, roller skating-and-lunch classes, recycling classes, dance and music classes. Children sign up for 12 week programs and their teachers walk them to their special programs. Most of these programs are at 11:45 a.m. to 12:30 p.m. and 3:15 to 4:30 p.m.

Toddler play group classes are available to children who will be two years old by December 31. These groups meet either two or three times a week for two hours at 9:30 a.m. or 12:45 p.m. There are a maximum of 12 children in a group and two teachers. These teachers do not need to be certified, but many of them are.

Classes are offered for 12 week sessions for new born to 12 months old and a parent, 12 to 17 months old and a parent, 18 to 24 months old and a parent, 25 to 35 months old and a parent, 2 to 3 years old and a parent and slow separation classes for 2- and 3-year-olds. These classes generally meet on Tuesdays and Thursdays in rooms where three day classes meet. Most classes meet from 9:30 to 10:30 a.m.

Program classes are also offered on Sunday mornings for parents who are unavailable during the week. These meet from 10:00 to 11:00 a.m.

Vacation programs are offered during all school vacations. These programs include entertainment, stories, videos, art activities, play time and snack. Children attend from 12:30 to 3:30 p.m. These programs are open to members and non-members.

The student's role in the setting

The writer's role involved many different areas. Scheduling for room availability is one of those areas. Since the building is shared with many different departments, rooms must be requested in writing for each program and class to avoid scheduling concurrent activities in the same room.

Curriculum is written and revised by the writer. Lesson plans are reviewed and discussed on a monthly basis with each head teacher. Curriculum meetings are held by the writer every other week at 11:45 a.m. - 12:30 p.m. alternating teachers of 3-year-olds with teachers of 4-year-olds.

The writer is also responsible for budgeting, writing, planning and staffing all programs, classes and vacation programs.

Speaking with parents, registering children for classes, making decisions concerning refunds, transfer of money to other departments and the appropriate paper work is also part of the writer's job.

Meeting with parents and teachers to discuss individual children and their needs is an integral part of the writer's job, as is observing and evaluating teachers on a regular basis.

As a member of a large agency part of the writer's job is to give tours of the building to prospective members, participate in all registrations and attend agency activities.

The writer's job did not have a written job description, therefore the writer did just about anything her supervisor requested. The job description was truly a work in progress.

Chapter II - The Problem

Problem statement

Within the writer's agency seniors and pre-schoolers were involved in age appropriate activities, but there were no opportunities available during which they could interact.

Documentation of the problem

"In 1900 only four Americans in 100 were 65 years old or older. Within 80 years our society has experienced a demographic transition that is startling indeed - today one of every nine Americans is 65 or older, totaling 25 million older Americans. It is expected that by the year 2030 as many as one in five will be old." So stated Robert N. Butler, gerontologist and psychiatrist (in McDuffie, 1989, p. viii).

The writer concurs with Butler (in McDuffie, 1989) that the implications could be staggering. As an educator, the writer strongly believed and the literature supported the concept that educators have a responsibility to prepare young children to deal with a population of older Americans.

McDuffie (1989) explains that "Education about the process of human aging, about continuity of the individual throughout changes across the life span and about old age as a time of wisdom and continuing personal growth - can help prepare our children for their own later years" (p. viii).

Jantz, Seefeldt, Galper and Serock (in Seefeldt and Warman, 1990) go on to state that the way today's society "meets the challenges of an aging population begins with how today's young children learn about the elderly and about their own aging" (p. vii).

Patricia T. Austin (in Albert and Clark, 1995), Vice President of the Condell Day Center for Intergenerational Care in Libertyville, IL, very clearly stated just how important the problem of an aging population is to our children and society in general.

If we can open ourselves to the possibility that, even with diminished faculties, elders have something real to teach - that we can still touch and be touched by them - that, on a very real level, they retain that spark of individual humanity that identifies our commonality - that elders make a contribution to our lives - then the opportunity to enjoy their continuing experience of living will open the way for understanding the value of day care intergenerational programming (p. 83).

Although numerous pieces of literature pointed to the need for intergenerational programming, a basic problem exists in present day life. In Health Magazine (1992) Stefi Weisburd's article clearly defines the problem.

A generation ago, such a meeting of young and old occurred spontaneously between children and their own grandparents. But in today's mobile and divorce prone society, families are fragmented, scattered all over the map. Generations are estranged by the way we live and work: children are sequestered in schools and day care, seniors are tucked away in nursing and retirement homes and middle aged adults busy themselves in a vortex of downtown office buildings (p. 83 - 84).

In other words, senior adults and young children rarely have the opportunity to interact. Generations of the past had seniors as part of their everyday existence, participating in all aspects of life.

Carol Seefeldt (in Seefeldt, 1987) explained that

In North American culture it is not easy for three generations to share one another's living presence. Older people are separated from the young in many ways. This separation of the age groups takes place as children and elders lack opportunity to develop informal relations in family and neighborhood. The connections between young and old are broken as the natural ways the generations used to interact and relate are no longer available (p. 14).

Carol H. Tice in Children Today (1982) also described life today as compared with the past and the opportunities that children had to interact with senior adults as well as with the "understanding that at a basic level, seasons come and go with regularity, reminding us of the rhythm and continuity of the life cycle . . . Children of earlier, rural America understood the relation of land, water and air in reference to their own survival" (pp. 2 -3).

Several other articles also viewed this trend of age separation as a factor in young people's negative feelings towards the elderly. These include Baum, Newman and Shore (1982); Comfort (1976); Hickey, Hickey and Kalesh (1968); Marks, Newman and Onawola (1985); Lyons, Onawola and Newman (1985); McDuffie, Brieme, Patch, Nash and Brown (1983); Newman, Vasuldev and Baum (1983); Seefeldt (1977); Seefeldt, Jantz, Galper and Serock (1977); Smith, Newman (1993) and Tice (1985) (in Lowenthal and Egan, 1991). It is clear from the literature that the separation of generations in our society has had a great impact. Lowenthal and Egan (1991) go as far as stating that "For children, the special care, individual attention, interest and nurturance that seniors can provide is no longer a resource for them" (pp. 363 - 364).

Perschenbacher (1985 in Kocarnik and Ponzetti, 1991) saw a poignant side effect of children growing up with very little contact with elderly people, that being an emotional separation and the “development of negative perceptions and fear of the elderly” (p. 105).

It was clear to the writer that there was an overwhelming amount of literature and evidence of an existing problem in our present society which encouraged a lack of interaction between senior citizens and young children.

Analysis of the problem

At the writer’s agency senior citizens and pre-schoolers were physically in proximity on a regular basis in the center but they rarely interacted. Given the fact that both of these populations would greatly benefit, emotionally, socially and intellectually from ongoing interaction, programs should be developed to encourage this type of interaction.

The feelings and interest of the senior citizens, children, parents and staff needed to be explored to see if there was an interest in this type of intergenerational programming. Availability of rooms and times when participation was possible had to be considered within the framework of the center.

Providing suitable activities which would be of interest to both populations had to be carefully explored and modified to accommodate the needs of the participants in order to make programming appealing to both the senior and pre-school populations.

There were many factors which contributed to the presence of the problem, the first being that the lack of intergenerational program had not been viewed as a problem in by the agency. Many of the writer’s staff members and administration were reluctant to embark on projects that required changes in scheduling, room reservations and innovative change. The status quo was

very evident in programming. The common thread was that the agency has never had any intergenerational programs before and no one had complained, so why were programs needed now? Interviews with the senior services director, S. Kohn (personal communication, May, 1996), indicated that a lack of time for planning and coordination had precluded any further planning in this area. However, she was more than willing to participate in planning if the writer would initiate the program.

Parents may be reluctant to have their children participate in a program which may expose them to senior citizens who are not family members and who may be unknown to the parents. The parents in the writer's center were very protective of their children. The emotional element of parents missing their own parents impacted upon parents' willingness to have their children participate in this type of program.

Many of the families were two income families with live-in, non-English speaking help. Frequently grandparents had moved out of state to warmer climates. In these situations the children had little or no contact with senior citizens on a regular basis. These conditions made the continuity of traditions and values extremely difficult, thereby depriving the children of an enriching part of society. Random phone conversations indicated that 9 out of 15 families surveyed had live-in, non-English speaking help. However, many of those families also had grandparents living close by who they saw frequently, but for short periods of time.

To get a better idea of what parents thought about intergenerational programs, a questionnaire (Appendix A) was given out randomly to 65 parents. Forty-eight questionnaires were returned.

A large number of the respondents considered a person to be elderly at ages 70 to 75. Not one family had an elderly person in their household. But only 14 parents responded that they interacted with a senior on a regular basis. This included interactions of their children with seniors as well.

All of the respondents thought that it was important for the children to spend time with seniors and 23 were willing to pay extra for their children to be involved in this type of opportunity, but 39 would be interested in this type of programming only if scheduled during the regular school day.

Several parents expressed concern about their child becoming emotionally involved with a senior who might become ill or possibly die.

The writer made several follow up calls to help determine ages of seniors that these families had contact with. The findings were of great interest. Many of the grandparents that live close by were in the 60 to 68 year old range. These seniors were very active, either working or very involved in their own interests and were not available for daily baby sitting. Many of the homes with live-in help also had young grandparents living within 30 minutes of the grandchildren.

The writer clearly saw a problem. Seniors may not want to be bothered with small children. Many seniors came to the center to participate in adult activities, e.g. discussion groups, playing bridge, exercise classes, art and sculpture classes. They may not have been willing to give up some of their time to participate in intergenerational programs.

Questionnaires (see Appendix B) were randomly given to seniors attending various programs over a three day period. Eighty-seven questionnaires were given out and 72 were

returned. The seniors ranged in age from 60 to 82 years old. Most of the seniors responded that they had contact with their own children at least once a month. Very few respondents, under 25, indicated that they would like to do things with children under age 6. Those that responded positively were interested in possibly reading stories, cooking, doing crafts and enjoying singing with the children. Many indicated that they feel nervous and annoyed when they are around children.

In informal conversations with seniors the writer found that the younger seniors were more interested in pursuing their own interests rather than spending time with young children, while the older seniors felt they may be nervous and annoyed with “little ones running around.” It was clear to the writer that a problem truly existed.

The children were very curious to participate in the survey (see Questionnaire for Children in Appendix C). One hundred children responded to the questions. Most of the children responded that they knew someone who was old and that person had white hair and wrinkles. Only 62 children responded that old people have fun, and 4 children thought that old people could ride a bike. However, 73 children agreed that seniors would like to eat ice cream and 76 agreed that old people eat soft food.

Many of the children responded that they had visited an old person and 64 responded that they had fun. Fifty-eight responded they would like to visit again. However, only six of the children responded that they will ever be old.

It was clear to the writer that these children could learn about seniors and growing older from participating in intergenerational activities.

It was also clear to the writer that a problem existed in the writer's agency. Seniors and pre-schoolers occupied the building at the same time, but they did not have opportunities to interact.

Chapter III - Goals and Objectives

It has been substantiated and established through a literature search and other sources that through ongoing interactions between the generations children and older people can “reestablish caring relationships” (Mead in McDuffie, 1990, p.35).

Through interviews and questionnaires at the writer’s agency evidence shows that opportunities for interaction need to be developed to encourage participation by seniors, parents and children. “. . . the continuity of all culture depends on the living presence of at least three generations” (Mead in Seefeldt, 1987, p.14).

Goal:

The goal of this practicum was to develop a variety of opportunities for interaction between senior citizens and 3- and 4-year-old children.

Objectives:

1. During a 10 week program the writer would determine opportunities for bringing seniors and 3- and 4-year-old children together. These opportunities would be selected by an evaluation team comprised of two parents, two senior services staff members, two seniors, two pre-school staff members and the writer. The evaluation team would select at least eight opportunities for bringing seniors and pre-schoolers together.
2. The writer would develop a check list of developmentally appropriate opportunities. These selected opportunities would be rated as developmentally appropriate, according to established criteria in early childhood education and senior services, by an evaluation team consisting of two senior services staff members, two pre-school staff members and the writer.

3. The writer would field test the developed opportunities with no fewer than five parents and no fewer than five senior citizens. These participants would not be members of either evaluation team. The expected outcome would be a positive response to at least three of the identified opportunities as measured by the results of a questionnaire (see Appendix D). A response to an opportunity would be considered positive if at least 50% of the questionnaires had at least two 'yes' answers.

Chapter IV - Solution Strategy

Review of existing programs, models and approaches

The literature strongly supports the need for intergenerational opportunities. Kornhaber and Woodward (in McDuffie, 1989) describe how seniors in our society may spend their later years separated geographically and or emotionally from their families. This loss of social roles which includes daily grandparenting and the sharing of family histories and traditions is a great loss to the children and seniors.

Many models for intergenerational opportunities were discussed in the literature. One outstanding model takes place in Broome County, NY. In 1979 funds were made available by the National Association for the Education of Young Children (NAEYC) through a Membership Action Grant. McDuffie (1989) explains that this grant allowed for the purchase of children's books on generational themes. The books are made available through a lending library. Along with the development of the lending library a committee from the Broome County Child Development Council held meetings regularly to discuss the feasibility of intergenerational day care.

These discussions led to a grant proposal to the Robert Schumann Foundation. In 1980 the Schumann Foundation funded a six month pilot for developing intergenerational activities between seniors and pre-school children in Broome County. Various visits were planned for children and residents of both nursing homes and hospitals. The program was so successful that further funding was made available by the Schumann Foundation and several other funding sources.

The writer believes that one of the most important elements in the Broome County experience is the time that was taken to identify goals, plan and coordinate continuously and to evaluate the program's effectiveness at periodic intervals (McDuffie, 1989).

Broome County's program has many elements not in common with the writer's site. The availability of 3- and 4-year-olds is a common element, however the seniors involved were from the agency. Therefore logistical planning opportunities for interaction take on a somewhat different tone.

In terms of the planning the Broome County model is a very similar process to the writer's practicum objectives. The Broome County example includes regular meetings to not only discuss the concept of intergenerational programs, but their feasibility.

Funding is an issue at Broome County but not an issue at the writer's agency. Broome depends on grants from various sources for funding. At the writer's site, no additional funding was needed for the 10 week implementation time.

The selection of the writer's strategies was predicated on the fact that there were very few staff, seniors and children in attendance during the summer months when the practicum was conducted.

The Condell Day Care Center for Intergenerational Care accommodates both seniors and pre-school children. This model accepts children from 6 weeks to 6 years old and adults over age 55. This center is especially suited to elders who can no longer live alone. The center provides daily opportunities for interaction between 135 children and 40 older adults.

The Condell model has eight classrooms filled with "tools of learning that foster development" (Albert and Clark, 1995). The seniors are free to come to the classroom to play

games, draw and tell stories.

The seniors have their own area, which is a home-like setting. The children visit each morning for songfests, crafts and games.

Albert (1995) goes to great lengths to assure that developmental differences are carefully examined and dealt with. "Intergenerational programming brings seniors and children together remarkably well rather than accentuating the differences between the two groups" (Albert, 1995).

The writer's physical site precluded the use of one area for seniors. All the rooms in the agency are used for many different programs. The writer's site has eight classrooms which could accommodate seniors on a regular basis. However, seniors generally attend specific groups' activities when they are on site. Whether or not they would come just to participate in intergenerational programming remained to be seen.

The seniors at the Condell model differ greatly from the seniors at the writer's site. Condell seniors are elder adults who can no longer function on their own. The seniors at the writer's site, for the most part, range from very able and active to less able to get around with a little assistance. The writer foresaw the possibility that many of these seniors would not want to give up or add to their regular activities.

The St. Francis Garden's Day Care in Albuquerque, NM, is another unique example of an intergenerational model. In 1983 Encino House, a nursing home and affiliated retirement center, added a child care center. This center was developed for 140 children, aged six weeks to six

years. The program schedule includes

at least five scheduled intergenerational activities every day, from a 30 minute morning exercise class to an afternoon rhythm band session. Children and elders garden together, play show and tell, read stories and hold a monthly birthday party. Twice a week, two children join their grandparents for lunch (Weisburd, 1992, p. 82).

In the St. Francis model it is clear that the seniors are readily available for any and all programs, again because they live on site. This was not an option at the writer's center. According to Weisburd (1992) many other models of this type are being developed across the country. These so called "linked programs" include: Messiah Village Retirement Center in Mechanicsburg, PA, and the McKinley Center in Canton, OH, which is housed in a multi-story building complex that includes shops and restaurants.

The writer was very interested in the "Grandpals" concept, which is another linked program discussed by Weisburd (1992). Having an intergenerational opportunity which involved eating together was a strong possibility at the writer's agency. Further development needed to take place to determine the feasibility. However, seniors do eat and so do 3- and 4-year-olds (Weisburd).

Generations Together is an intergenerational model which takes another route. Sally Newman, Executive Director of Generations Together, planned a program out of the University of Pittsburgh which brought seniors and children together in "schools and community centers. They have had over 1,600 seniors who volunteered to work in western Pennsylvania public schools since 1984" (Weisburd, 1992, p. 83). The concept of using senior volunteers is one element that the writer hoped to explore.

Northeastern Illinois University, Chicago, IL, developed an intergenerational program which involved senior citizen volunteers with pre-school children in a university day care setting (Lowenthal, 1991). This model had as its major goal to enhance the children's reading readiness and to encourage a "mutually beneficial relationship between seniors and children" (Lowenthal, 1991, p. 365).

According to Lowenthal and Egan (1991) there are a number of other studies which indicate that reading to young children helps develop their reading readiness and social-emotional growth. These studies include: Barton (1986); Burns, Roe and Ross (1988); Harris and Sipay (1985); Heath (1982); Manolsen (1984); Mason (1982); Schickendanz (1979); Walton (1989) and Wells (1985).

In the Northeastern Illinois University model seniors could become volunteer aides, who would read stories to pre-school children. The seniors would also be available to help in ongoing center activities. "The seniors would then serve as resources in fostering reading readiness and providing youngsters with nurturance and emotional support" (Lowenthal, 1991, p. 365).

This model was very appealing to the writer. Having a large number of seniors at the writer's site afforded the opportunity to recruit volunteers for such a project.

The last model the writer examined was developed by Carol Tice in 1971. Although the program was initially planned to bring senior volunteers into Tice's art room, Tice hoped that the seniors would also bring "the time and love that some of her troubled students so desperately needed" (Tice in Ginnane, 1981, p. 7).

The model Teaching-Learning Communities (T-LC) grew rapidly and was even supported with not only federal funds but by local community support. Local funding was able to provide

transportation for the seniors by either taxi or van.

Each local T-LC program is carried out by a coordinator. Support for the older volunteers is given by a T-LC aide.

The seniors involved in the T-LC model range in age from 60 to 87. They volunteer on a schedule that is designed to fit their health, physical needs, interests and stamina, usually one half day once or twice weekly.

The T-LC volunteer grandpersons have previously planned appropriate activities with a cooperating teacher based on the seniors' interests and skills. The children, meeting in groups of three to seven, select an activity. They stay at the activity for approximately one hour.

The T-LC model had many elements that the writer felt would be applicable to the practicum site. The writer's site already had vans available at specific times during the day which could be used to transport seniors to the site. These vans were handicapped accessible and were owned by the agency. Therefore the only additional cost would be for a driver. This cost might be covered by the senior department since it would be quite low, or by a program fee charged to the parents of children wanting this type of program.

Rooms at the writer's site are often available during the middle of the day and at the end of the day in which the seniors and children could meet on a regular basis for activities.

The writer took on the role of coordinator along with a senior services staff member. There was no money budgeted for this type of programming. All costs would have to be covered by the Early Childhood and Senior Services departments or from fees charged to parents for specific programs.

The literature clearly showed the need for the development of intergenerational programs.

The models which the writer chose to discuss, and many others, proved that these type of opportunities can successfully bridge the generation gap.

Description of solution strategy

The strategy solution selected by the writer was predicated on the fact that the 10 week implementation phase (see Calendar Plan of Implementation, appendix E) would take place during the summer when there are few children and seniors available at the writer's site. Therefore the solution strategy chosen will concentrated on the development of opportunities.

The literature abounds with criteria for planning intergenerational programming which is developmentally appropriate. The National Association for the Education of Young Children (NAEYC) has several publications which address this topic.

The writer used elements from several of the models discussed since no one model suited the writer's needs. The two closest and most practical models were Broome County and T-LC for the following reasons.

The Broome County model provided the writer with excellent ideas for getting staff involved, contacting parents and developing appropriate goals for the project.

The T-LC model offered the writer aspects of transportation for seniors and accommodating their needs and interests which had to be taken into account during the initial planning stage.

The solution strategy simply stated was to engage parents, staff members from both the Senior Services and Early Childhood departments, and the writer in a dialogue which would culminate in a variety of opportunities during which seniors and 3- and 4-year-olds would interact. These dialogues would also provide the writer with information as to how much interest there

was at the practicum site for this type of programming, developmental appropriateness and other factors.

The writer foresaw little or no difficulty in engaging people in this process. Little or no funding was required for this solution strategy. Refreshments such as coffee and cake would be provided for the evaluation team. These small costs would be incurred by the Early Childhood Department.

The writer did not want to pick who would be on the teams as it might have biased the outcomes.

The writer contacted the Executive Director of the agency to let him know that these meetings would be taking place and invited him to give the evaluation team his input.

Parents on the writer's Parent Action Committee were contacted and asked if they would be available to participate in this ongoing process. The first two parents to respond were asked to participate. Others were invited to participate at a later date.

The writer asked the Senior Services Department to suggest possible candidates for the evaluation team.

Early Childhood staff were asked to volunteer to be on one of the evaluation teams. The first to volunteer was selected.

No problem was anticipated with implementing this solution strategy during the 10 week period since all participants were apprised of the time constraints before they volunteered.

Chapter V - Implementation

During the ten week implementation period the solution strategy previously described was utilized and modified as needed. The following is a detailed description of the implementation process.

Week #1

At the beginning of the week one of the implementation period 27 letters were sent to a random list of both seniors attending activities at the agency and parents of children enrolled in the agency's preschool programs (see sample letter in Appendix F). These letters requested a positive response if the recipient was available and interested in serving on an evaluation team. A similar letter was sent to six Senior Department staff members and six Early Childhood Department staff members.

Of the 27 letters, 14 were sent to preschool parents and 13 were sent to seniors. The writer received eight positive responses from parents, six positive responses from seniors, four positive responses from senior staff and four positive responses from early childhood staff. Follow up phone calls were made and a tentative meeting was set for the following Tuesday at 10:30 a.m. Two seniors, two parents, two senior staff members and two early childhood staff members were randomly selected to attend. All other participants were informed that they would be contacted as soon as the writer was able to schedule the meeting time for the second evaluation team. Two senior staff members and two early childhood staff members were contacted and appraised of possible meeting times.

A morning meeting time was chosen to accommodate seniors who needed the agency bus to transport them to and from the building. The morning time also met the needs of the parents and staff members involved.

Week #2

Although the meeting was scheduled for 10:30 a.m., it did not get started until 11:00. The writer's department supplied coffee and donuts.

Attending the meeting were two parents, two senior services staff members, two early childhood staff members, two seniors and the writer. Although the writer made several attempts to involve male seniors in the process, all attempts failed. This makes the writer wonder if it will be possible in the future to engage men in intergenerational programming with 3- and 4-year old children.

To begin the meeting the writer gave a description of the goals and objectives of the group. The writer explained that the job of the evaluation team would be to select at least eight opportunities for bringing seniors and preschoolers together. After this selection process the writer would help a second evaluation team to rate the selected opportunities according to developmental appropriateness.

The evaluation team spent the first 10 minutes of the meeting getting acquainted. The writer gave each member a name tag to wear. Each member introduced herself and stated which segment of the population she represented.

The process of listing opportunities was more complicated than the writer envisioned. The writer suggested that each team member think about what they felt were important aspects of intergenerational programming and then write individual lists.

The lists were collected and the writer told the members that the writer would compile a master list which would be mailed to each team member.

The next meeting was scheduled for the next week at 10:30. Several team members stressed how important it was to be prompt. The participants will get a postcard reminding them of the meeting.

Week #3

During this week the writer took the individual lists made by the team members and compiled them into a master list. The list consists of implementation issues. The writer was surprised at how similar the issues were as listed by the various participants.

The final list consists of the following:

- Opportunities should occur on a regular basis where possible.
- Opportunities should allow for seniors and preschoolers to spend time interacting.
- Opportunities should include activities during which learning takes place.
- Opportunities should be clearly defined and planned.
- Physical abilities of seniors and preschoolers must be considered.
- Opportunities should not be more than two hours in length.
- Staff should be trained to work with intergenerational groups.

This list was mailed to each participating member along with notification of the next meeting.

Weeks #4 and 5

The meetings were held on consecutive Tuesdays. At the week 4 meeting one senior and one parent representative were absent. The discussion was very lively. Coffee and refreshments

were again supplied by the writer's department. The meeting ended after only one hour because of room scheduling difficulties at the writer's agency.

The week 5 meeting was more productive. All the team members were present and the meeting began promptly at 10:30 am and ended at 12:30. The following is a list of possible opportunities as suggested by the team members. These are not listed in any particular order.

- Planting a garden together.
- Cooking classes for seniors and preschoolers.
- Movement classes for seniors and preschoolers.
- Going on a short trip together.
- Making a craft together.
- Preparing a meal and eat together.
- Story telling by seniors to a group.
- Seniors presenting a puppet show
- Eating lunch together two times a month with seniors and day care children.
- Story telling, enjoying a snack and singing once a month with preschoolers, parents and seniors.
- Going on a picnic.
- Pairing individual children with a senior citizen to meet once a week for an activity.

The meeting ended at 1:00. By this time the seniors were getting restless and the parents were anxious to leave. All agreed that they were surprised that they had come up with so many ideas. Several participants asked to be notified if and when any of the listed ideas became actual

programs. The writer assured all parties that they would be notified.

During week 5 the new evaluation team, consisting of two senior services staff members, two preschool teachers and the writer, were contacted and a meeting time arranged for Wednesday of week 6 at 1:30 pm.

Week #6

The second evaluation team met. The writer explained the goals and objectives to the group, the goal being to develop a variety of opportunities for interaction between senior citizens and 3- and 4-year-old children. The objective was to rate a selected list of opportunities according to a developmentally appropriate check list.

The following is a list of developmentally appropriate criteria with which the list of intergenerational opportunities was rated (Spillis, 1980):

Activities should be

- stimulating,
- engaging,
- challenging,
- constructive,
- creative,
- interesting,
- pleasurable,
- a change in routine.

The following is the list of developmentally appropriate goals that were selected as criteria for ranking the possible opportunities. These opportunities should (NAEYC, 1991):

- foster positive self-concepts,
- develop sound skills,
- encourage children to think, reason and experiment,
- encourage language development,
- enhance physical development and skills,
- encourage creative expression and appreciation for the arts,
- respect cultural diversity.

Along with the above goals the curriculum for these opportunities should follow the guidelines for curriculum content as stated in Bredekamp and Rosegrant (1992). These guidelines include the following:

- content that is relevant, engaging and meaningful.
- content is designed to achieve long range goals for children...social, emotional, cognitive and physical - and to prepare children to function as fully contributing members of a democratic society (pg. 19).

After developing this list of developmentally appropriate criteria the evaluation team and the writer decided that too many criteria had been stated. It was decided that the team would not be able to use that list. The team would go and back simplify.

The meeting was closed and the writer promised to pare down the list and another meeting was scheduled.

The writer worked on the list and reduced it to the following five criteria:

1. Interesting,
2. Creative,

3. Engaging,
4. Age appropriate,
5. Physically appropriate.

Week #7

At the next meeting the writer presented the shortened list and the team members agreed that this list was definitely more workable. The writer asked each team member to rank the previously discussed opportunities according to the criteria. It was very interesting that everyone eliminated the possibility of an intergenerational trip. They all felt that this idea was rife with difficulties.

The top ranked opportunities were as follows:

- Shabbat lunch with seniors and day care children two times a month.
- Cooking classes for seniors and preschoolers as a program a program paid for by the parents.
- Seniors volunteering to read to the children.
- Planting a garden.
- Pairing individual children with senior citizens to meet once a week after school hours for a planned activity.

The team felt that these opportunities could be age appropriately planned for both seniors and preschoolers and would really give everyone involved the opportunity to interact.

Weeks #8, 9 and 10

The writer refined questionnaires for parents and seniors (see Appendix D) which were used to field test the intergenerational opportunities. Seven seniors and 10 parents were given the

questionnaire. The writer distributed the questionnaire in the lobby of the agency and the respondents were asked to fill in the questionnaire on the spot. Of the people approached, all but one was willing to participate. A summary of the results is shown in Appendix G.

The results of the senior questionnaires were very encouraging. Six female seniors responded positively to at least three of the opportunities. The lone male senior responded positively to two of the opportunities.

The parents' results were also encouraging. One parent asked for more details about the programs than was available, such as what the fee for the cooking class would be and how the participating seniors would be selected, however all the other parents were very willing to participate. Out of the 10 parents who did participate all responded positively to at least three opportunities and most responded positively to at least four opportunities. The only program that did not pass the field test (i.e. fewer than 50% positive responses) was the cooking class. The writer is not sure if it was the possible additional fee or the whole concept.

The writer sent each member of both evaluation teams a letter (see Appendix H) thanking them for their participation and a review of the meetings. Implications for the future were also discussed.

Goals Met

The goal of the practicum was to identify at least three opportunities for intergenerational interaction. The results of the field test showed that four out of the five proposed opportunities would be accepted by the affected population. It is clear to this writer that the goal of the practicum has been met.

As the literature has stated there are many possible ways of problem solving. The method selected by the writer of using representatives from the involved population worked well to establish possibilities. The variety of possible intergenerational programs is endless. The process of defining the programs which will work best at the writer's agency lies at the heart of the strategy. This process enabled the writer to get the needed insight into the population to get a handle on what may or may not work.

The writer considers the 10 week implementation plan to have been successful. Lessons on planning meetings, structuring time and keeping focused have all been worthwhile for the writer's growth.

Chapter VI - Conclusions and Recommendations

As the literature and this study indicate, providing opportunities for interaction between senior citizens and 3- and 4-year-olds is a worthwhile endeavor. Positive self image, a link with the past and present and an appreciation of life are just a few of the benefits.

The outcome of this writer's 10 week implementation period was both encouraging and exciting. While researching solution strategies, the writer found that many of the solutions were either established by professionals who were interested in seeing seniors and children interact, or by groups of senior citizens who realized how beneficial these types of activities could be.

The writer's solution was unique in that it allowed for representation by each segment of the various populations involved.

The biggest drawback in the writer's planning came in misjudging the actual time needed for discussion. All those involved had a lot to say and the writer had some difficulty in keeping the group focused and on track. Everyone had a comment and wanted to be heard.

It became clear early on in the evaluation team meetings that the seniors' ideas for intergenerational programming were much less interactive than those ideas presented by the parents.

The writer strongly suggests that the evaluation teams consist of more members in order to hear from an increased number of interested parties, and perhaps not include teachers until a follow up meeting. Having the teachers present seemed to intimidate several of the seniors.

The team participants had no difficulty at all in coming up with ideas for interaction. The more difficult aspect came when the team tried to determine whether or not an opportunity was

developmentally appropriate. This was difficult since many people disagreed with what may or may not be appropriate.

It was rewarding to note the number of positive responses to the field test. This was encouraging to the writer and confirmed the writer's theory that intergenerational programming was not only appropriate but eagerly embraced by the community.

Recommendations of other work settings

The following modifications are recommended so that future planning will be beneficial to others:

- At least five representatives from each of the involved populations should be included in the meetings.
- The meetings should be either longer in duration or more frequent.
- More time should be spent discussing developmentally appropriate programs.
- At least three months should be allotted for this planning process.

Future Plans

As a result of this practicum plans are being made to include intergenerational programs in the future. Specific plans for intergenerational Shabbat lunches are being made. Senior citizens and 3- and 4-year-old children from the writer's day care program will meet for a Shabbat lunch every other Friday. The writer hopes that this will eventually expand into an hour and three quarter program which will include not only lunch but an activity program after lunch. Activities to be included need to be further developed.

Volunteers are being sought by the Senior Department for a future 'Grandpals' program. These volunteers will go into the classrooms on a regular basis. The writer wants to have in place

a core of volunteers before actually beginning the program.

A training handbook will be developed for all volunteers and follow up workshops will be developed for both staff and volunteers so that issues involving both seniors and 3- and 4-year-olds can be clarified.

The writer's Executive Director and immediate supervisor have been both supportive and encouraging throughout this process. They have both committed themselves to not only supporting intergenerational programming but in helping the writer find funding for these projects.

The writer will be presenting the outcome of this practicum at an Executive Board meeting and a staff meeting. Both meetings will be held during the winter months.

Summary

Literature has indicated the importance of intergenerational programming for all those involved. Searching for ways to do this that were appropriate for the writer's agency was an intriguing process. Through this process the writer was able to provide concrete programs which can now be put into place.

These programs are only a beginning. It is the writer's hope that the results of this practicum will serve as the basis for further programs which will recognize each stage in life as part of one's whole life span.

References

- Albert, Ian and Clark, Mary Jeanne. (1995, November - December). Aging intergenerationally. [On-line]. Available: <http://www.consciouschoice.com/novdec95/intergenaging.html>.
- Bredenkamp, Sue and Rosegrant, Teresa. (1990). Reaching potentials: Appropriate curriculum and assessment for young children. Volume 1. Washington, DC: NAEYC.
- Ginnane, Patrick. (1981). Intergenerational education: Young and old learning together. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 239 775)
- Horowitz, Belhamie. (1993). The New York Jewish population study. New York: UJA-Federation of New York.
- Kocarnik, Roseanne A. And Ponzetti, James J. (1991). The advantages and challenges of intergenerational programs in long term care facilities. Journal of Gerontological Social Work, 16 (1 / 2).
- Long Island Lighting Company. (1995). Population Survey 1995. Hicksville, N. Y.: Author.
- Lowenthal, Barbara and Egan, Rosemary. (1991). Senior citizens in a university day-care center. Educational Gerontology, 17: 363 - 378.
- Lyons, Charles W. Interagency alliances link young and old. Children Today. Volume 15. September - October, 1986. p. 21 - 25.
- McDuffie, Winifred G. And Whitman, Judith R. (1989). Intergenerational activities handbook, third edition. Endicott: Union Press Company, Inc.
- Seefeldt, Carol. (1987, October). Intergenerational programs: Making them work. Childhood Education, pp. 14 - 18.

Seefeldt, Carol and Warman, Barbara. (1990). Young and old together. Washington, DC: NAEYC.

Tice, Carol H. (1982, September - October). Continuity: A gift from the older generation. Children Today, VII, pp. 2 - 6.

Townsend, P. (1996). An annual supplement of Long Island Business News. 1996 Long Island Almanac. 21.

Weisburd, Stefi. (1992, April). Grandpals, link of ages. Health Magazine, pp. 82 - 84.

Appendix A

Questionnaire for Parents

Questionnaire for Parents

1. At what age do you consider a person to be elderly?
60 - 65 65 - 70 70 - 75 75 - 80 80+
2. Do you have an elderly person living in your household?
Yes No
3. Do you interact on a regular basis with a senior citizen?
Once a week Once a month More than once a month
4. Does your child (children) have contact with a senior citizen on a regular basis?
Once a week Once a month More than once a month
5. Do you think it is important for 3- and 4-year-olds to spend time with senior citizens?
Yes No
6. Would you be willing to pay an extra fee for your child to be in a program which would involve interaction with senior citizens?
Yes No
7. Would you be interested in having your child interact with senior citizens during the regular pre-school day?
Yes No

8. Do you think that the senior citizens would benefit from interaction with pre-school children?

Yes No

9. Are you looking forward to being a senior citizen?

Yes No

10. Do you have any concerns about your child participating in intergenerational programming?

Yes No

If yes, please comment _____

Your Name _____

Telephone _____ - _____

Age of Child _____

Appendix B

Questionnaire for Senior Citizens

Questionnaire for Senior Citizens

1. Do you know many children?
Yes No
2. Are they related to you?
Yes No
3. Did you have children of your own?
Yes No
4. Do you have contact with your children
At least once a week
At least once a month
Once a year
Less than once a year
5. Would you like to have more contact with your children?
Yes No
6. Do you like to do things with children under age 6?
Yes No
7. What things would you enjoy doing with a child under age 6?

8. How do you feel when you are around children?

Happy Annoyed Frustrated
Sad Nervous Comfortable

9. Do you enjoy being a senior citizen?

Yes No

Why? _____

10. Would you enjoy being a child again?

Yes No

Why? _____

Appendix C

Questionnaire for Children

Questionnaire for Children

1. Do you know anyone who is old?
Yes No
2. Is that person a relative?
Yes No
3. Is that person a friend?
Yes No
4. Do you think a person is old if they have white hair?
Yes No
5. Do you think a person is old if they have wrinkles?
Yes No
6. Do you think that old people can have fun?
Yes No
7. Do you think that old people can ride a bike?
Yes No
8. Do you think that old people can go for a walk?
Yes No
9. Do you think that old people like to eat?
Yes No
10. Do you think that old people like to eat ice cream?
Yes No
11. Do you think that old people eat only soft food?

Yes No

12. Do you think that old people are different from you?

Yes No

13. Did you ever visit an old person?

Yes No

14. Did you have fun when you visited you?

Yes No

15. What did you enjoy doing with the person you visited?

16. Was there anything you didn't like about your visit?

Yes No

17. Would you want to spend time with an older person again?

Yes No

18. How old are you?

19. Will you ever be old?

Yes No

20. Would you want to be old?

Yes No

Appendix D

Questionnaires for Opportunity Evaluation

Questionnaire for Opportunity Evaluation

Description of Opportunity:

Seniors and preschoolers enrolled in the Day Care program would join together every other Friday for a Shabbat Lunch. They would recite the blessings, share challah and celebrate welcoming Shabbat together. Food would be supplied for the seniors in the same manner as alternate weeks. The teachers would prepare food for the children. There would be no additional fee. Busing would be available for seniors if needed.

1. Do you consider this intergenerational opportunity age appropriate?
Yes No
2. Would you participate or want your child to participate in this intergenerational opportunity?
Yes No
3. Do you think you or your child would benefit from participating in this intergenerational opportunity?
Yes No

Questionnaire for Opportunity Evaluation

Description of Opportunity:

Seniors and preschoolers would meet once a week for a cooking class. A teacher and senior staff member would facilitate this class. Each class would culminate in eating the food which has been prepared. There would be an additional fee for parents of children participating in this program. Busing would be available for seniors if needed.

1. Do you consider this intergenerational opportunity age appropriate?

Yes No

2. Would you participate or want your child to participate in this intergenerational opportunity?

Yes No

3. Do you think you or your child would benefit from participating in this intergenerational opportunity?

Yes No

Questionnaire for Opportunity Evaluation

Description of Opportunity:

Seniors would commit to a specific number of hours during which they would be available to visit a classroom to read to the children. Classrooms would be assigned so that the seniors would visit with the same children each visit. Visits would be on a regular pre-determined schedule. Time would be set aside for seniors and teachers to discuss possible book or story telling selections. There would be no fee to participate in this program.

Busing would be available for seniors if needed.

1. Do you consider this intergenerational opportunity age appropriate?
Yes No
2. Would you participate or want your child to participate in this intergenerational opportunity?
Yes No
3. Do you think you or your child would benefit from participating in this intergenerational opportunity?
Yes No

Questionnaire for Opportunity Evaluation

Description of Opportunity:

Each senior would be assigned two children to participate in a garden project. An area of ground which would be easily accessible to both seniors and children would be set aside for each gardening team. A teacher and senior staff member would supervise this program. All tools and planting materials would be supplied. Each gardening team would meet two times a month. During the bad weather months teams would do indoor activities related to planting. Parents would pay an additional fee to have their children participate, no fee would be charged to seniors. Busing would be available for seniors if needed.

1. Do you consider this intergenerational opportunity age appropriate?
Yes No
2. Would you participate or want your child to participate in this intergenerational opportunity?
Yes No
3. Do you think you or your child would benefit from participating in this intergenerational opportunity?
Yes No

Questionnaire for Opportunity Evaluation

Description of Opportunity:

Seniors citizens would be paired with individual children to meet once a week after school for a planned activity. Activities would be planned according to individual talents and preferences. A teacher and a senior staff member would supervise. There would be an additional fee for parents of participating children, no fee would be charged to seniors. Busing would be available for seniors if needed.

1. Do you consider this intergenerational opportunity age appropriate?
Yes No
2. Would you participate or want your child to participate in this intergenerational opportunity?
Yes No
3. Do you think you or your child would benefit from participating in this intergenerational opportunity?
Yes No

Appendix E

Calendar Plan for Implementation

Calendar plan for implementation activities

Week 1

- Send out letters asking for volunteers to serve on the evaluation teams and explaining the time frame.
- Acknowledge letters with a personal phone call to those who will serve.
- If no positive responses are received, make phone calls to other possible candidates.
- Set a date for Week 2 meeting.

Week 2

- Meet with the evaluation team, consisting of two parents, two senior services staff members, two early childhood staff members, two seniors and the writer.
- The writer will give a description of the objectives and goals as outlined in chapter 3.
- The writer will facilitate discussion as to the team members participation.
- The writer will ask team members to think about what they feel are important aspects of intergenerational programs.
- Team members will make individual lists of implementation issues.

Week 3

- The writer will compile one master list and distribute to team members to think about.

Week 4 and 5

- Meet with evaluation team.
- The writer will facilitate a brainstorming session to create a list of possible opportunities, using established management techniques.
- The writer will write the list on large paper.

- Parent and senior concerns will be considered through the process by ongoing input.

Week 6

- Meet with the new evaluation team, consisting of two senior services staff members, two pre-school teachers and the writer.
- The writer will facilitate a selection process which will result in opportunities that are developmentally appropriate based on established early childhood and senior adult criteria.

Week 7

- The writer will distribute lists and facilitate further breakdown of possible opportunities.

Week 8

- The writer will facilitate a field test of the developed opportunities by having no less than five parents and five seniors rate the proposed opportunities. The field test will be considered to have succeeded in its goal if there is a positive response to at least three of the identified opportunities. A response to an opportunity will be considered positive if at least 50% of the questionnaires have at least two 'yes' answers.

Week 9

- The writer will compile the results of the field test.
- The writer will evaluate the solution strategy to ascertain whether or not the goal and objectives have been met.

Week 10

- The writer will review the results of the field test of the proposed program. A written synopsis and recommendation will be given to all team members and the Executive Director of the writer's agency.

Appendix F

Parent and Senior Involvement Letter

BOARD OF DIRECTORS

President

Chairman of the Board

Vice Presidents

Treasurer

Associate Treasurer

Secretary

Honorary Trustees

Board Members

*past presidents

Executive Director

Ass't Executive Director

May 30, 1996

Dear Parent or Senior,

The population at the Mid-Island Y JCC consists of people from infants to the elderly. Two of the most numerous and active groups are our 3- and 4-year-olds and our senior citizens.

The Early Childhood Department is searching for ways to bring its children together with the seniors already using our agency in meaningful and mutually satisfying activities.

If you are interested in helping us develop opportunities for senior citizens and 3- and 4-year-olds to interact, please return the bottom of this letter to the Early Childhood Department.

Thank you for your interest,

Joyce Weeks
Assistant Director, Early Childhood

jw:ew

_____ YES I am interested in developing opportunities for seniors and pre-schoolers to interact.
_____ NO I am not interested.

Name _____ Availability to meet _____ AM
Address _____ PM
Telephone # _____ Need Transportation _____ Yes
_____ No

Appendix G

Field Test Results Summary

Field Test Survey Results

Number of 'Yes' Responses*

Participant	Shabbat Lunch	Cooking Class	Reading	Gardening	Grandpals
Senior #1	2	1	3	3	3
Senior #2	2	1	3	0	2
Senior #3	3	0	3	1	2
Senior #4	3	1	2	2	3
Senior #5	3	2	3	3	3
Senior #6	3	1	3	3	3
Senior #7	3	1	1	3	0
Parent #1	2	1	2	3	3
Parent #2	3	1	2	2	3
Parent #3	3	0	2	1	3
Parent #4	3	2	3	1	2
Parent #5	3	1	3	2	0
Parent #6	3	1	3	3	2
Parent #7	2	0	3	2	3
Parent #8	3	0	3	3	3
Parent #9	3	3	2	3	3
Parent #10	3	1	3	2	2
Total 'Positive' Responses*	17	3	16	13	15

* A response to a program is considered 'positive' if it received 2 or more 'Yes' answers.

Appendix H

Evaluation Team Letter

BOARD OF DIRECTORS

President

Chairman of the Board

Vice Presidents

Treasurer

Associate Treasurer

Secretary

Honorary Trustees

Board Members

*past presidents

Executive Director

Ass't Executive Director

Dear _____,

Thank you so much for participating in my effort to develop a variety of programs for interaction between senior and 3- and 4-year-old children at the JCC.

Our meetings were always lively and interesting. Everyone had input in the discussion and the results were great.

The selected programs were (in ranked order):

- Bimonthly Shabbat lunch with day care children and seniors.
- Seniors reading to children on a regular basis.
- Pairing of individual seniors with a child to meet once a week for a planned activity.
- Planting an intergenerational garden.
- Cooking classes for seniors and children.

Developing these programs and training staff now lies ahead. I hope that I can call on you again for your suggestions and ideas.

Thanks for a job well done,

Joyce Weeks
Assistant Director, Early Childhood

jw:ew



U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement (OERI)
Educational Resources Information Center (ERIC)



REPRODUCTION RELEASE

(Specific Document)

I. DOCUMENT IDENTIFICATION:

Title Developing Opportunities for Senior Citizens and 3-and 4-year old Children in a Northeast U.S. Jewish Community Center to Interact	
Author(s) Joyce Weeks	
Corporate Source	Publication Date

II. REPRODUCTION RELEASE:

In order to disseminate as widely as possible timely and significant materials of interest to the educational community, documents announced in the monthly abstract journal of the ERIC system, *Resources in Education* (RIE), are usually made available to users in microfiche, reproduced paper copy, and electronic/optical media, and sold through the ERIC Document Reproduction Service (EDRS) or other ERIC vendors. Credit is given to the source of each document, and, if reproduction release is granted, one of the following notices is affixed to the document.

If permission is granted to reproduce the identified document, please CHECK ONE of the following options and sign the release below.



Sample sticker to be affixed to document

Sample sticker to be affixed to document



Check here

Permitting
microfiche
(4"x 6" film),
paper copy,
electronic,
and optical media
reproduction

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS
MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Sample

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES
INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

Level 1

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS
MATERIAL IN OTHER THAN PAPER
COPY HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Sample

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES
INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

Level 2

or here

Permitting
reproduction
in other than
paper copy.

Sign Here, Please

Documents will be processed as indicated provided reproduction quality permits. If permission to reproduce is granted, but neither box is checked, documents will be processed at Level 1.

"I hereby grant to the Educational Resources Information Center (ERIC) nonexclusive permission to reproduce this document as indicated above. Reproduction from the ERIC microfiche or electronic/optical media by persons other than ERIC employees and its system contractors requires permission from the copyright holder. Exception is made for non-profit reproduction by libraries and other service agencies to satisfy information needs of educators in response to discrete inquiries."

Signature: *Joyce Weeks*

Position:

Printed Name: *JOYCE WEEKS*

Organization:

Nova Southeastern University

Address:
**FCAE/LSCA
3301 College Avenue
Ft. Lauderdale, FL 33314**

Telephone Number:

Date:

Att: Dr. Adela Beckerman

OVER

610248022219

III. DOCUMENT AVAILABILITY INFORMATION (FROM NON-ERIC SOURCE):

If permission to reproduce is not granted to ERIC, or if you wish ERIC to cite the availability of this document from another source, please provide the following information regarding the availability of the document. (ERIC will not announce a document unless it is publicly available, and a dependable source can be specified. Contributors should also be aware that ERIC selection criteria are significantly more stringent for documents which cannot be made available through EDRS.)

Publisher/Distributor	
Address	
Price Per Copy	Quantity Price

IV. REFERRAL OF ERIC TO COPYRIGHT/REPRODUCTION RIGHTS HOLDER:

If the right to grant reproduction release is held by someone other than the addressee, please provide the appropriate name and address.

Name and address of current copyright/reproduction rights holder:
Name
Address

V. WHERE TO SEND THIS FORM:

Send this form to the following ERIC Clearinghouse:

If you are making an unsolicited contribution to ERIC, you may return this form (and the document being contributed) to:

ERIC Facility
1301 Piccard Drive, Suite 300
Rockville, Maryland 20850-4305
Telephone: (301) 258-5500